

- (a) *Tras Jivas* having two sense organs : Besides the sense organ of touch they have the sense organ of taste as well. They can therefore feel whether anything is sour or sweet, bitter, pungent or astringent. Being possessed of Tongue they have also Voice. Worms, Shells, Conches are examples of *Jivas* possessing two sense organs.
- (b) *Tras Jivas Having Three Sense Organs* such as Bugs, Ants, White ants etc. Besides the sense-organs of touch and taste they have the sense organ of smell as well. They can feel good or bad smell.
- (c) *Tras Jivas Having Four Sense Organs* such as Scorpions, Flies, Mosquitoes, Bees, and Crickets. Besides the above three organs they also possess eyes and as such can distinguish the five colours such as Black, Yellow, Indigo, Red and White.
- (d) *Tras Jivas Having Five Sense Organs*. They possess all the sense organs viz - that of touch, taste, smell, sight and hearing. There are four varieties of these *Jivas* (1) The *Jivas* of the hells, (2) The Gods, (3) Human beings and (4) Infra-human beings such as beasts and birds.

Jainism preaches *Ahimsa* towards all the six kinds of living beings from the one sensed ones to the five sensed ones. It preaches equality of all these beings in the domain of religion and does not distinguish even between the small and invisible ones and the visible rational beings like the human ones. It recognises the sanctity of the lives of all

beings and enjoins complete *Ahimsa* towards all in whatever state of existence they may be. Jainism preaches that in spiritual field there is no room for relative value. Man may be a rational being possessing all the sense organs but so far as the feelings of pleasure and pain are concerned, it is the same in all beings and as such injury to small beings is as sinful as the injury to rational men. A rich man may have millions and the other, a poor a penny. Depriving the poor of the penny causes him the same agony as depriving the rich of his millions. The difference in the value of the penny and million does not make any difference between the feelings of the two. Both hold their possessions as equally valuable. So also one being may be quite undeveloped and possessed of only one sense, the other may be more developed and possessed of more than one sense but that is no reason why one should be privileged and the other ignored in the domain of religion. Why the killing of one should be discouraged and that of the other condoned? Jainism teaches that injury is sinful in relation to all and should be avoided as much in the case of the small beings as in the case of the big ones. "All beings desire to live. Non aspires for death. Therefore the sinful killing should always be avoided." A Jeweller may put different values on different kinds of jewels according to their qualities but a religious minded man cannot attach different values to different lives on the basis of their outward development. He has to look to the psychology of value of one's own life. "To do unto others what one would like others to do unto him"—is the maxim which can be said to be the best indicator of the psychology of others and the determinative factor of behaviour towards others. Jainism has preached the love for the feelings of others from time immemorial and have laid great emphasis to look upon other beings.

upon one's own soul and not to wound the feelings of any body in the world

The following verses from the Jain Scriptures illustrate the point profusely

પુદાણી જીયા પુદો સત્તા આડ જીયા તહાગળી
ઘાડ જીયા પુદો સત્તા તળદક્ષ્યા સમીયના

(1) Earth, (2) Water, (3) Fire (4) Air, and (5) Vegetables Grass Trees and Corns all—these are different identities of *Jivas*

અહતવરા તમા પાળા પન છત્રાય આહિયા
પચાનપ જાણવાન નાપરે કોઈ યિજ્ઞહ

The above five and the *Tras Jivas* these form the six classes of living beings. There is no class of *Jivas* other than these

જે ઘેરે તસા પાળા ચિટ્ઠિ અહુન ધાયરા
પરિયાપ અતિય સે અન્નૂ જોન તે તસ ધાયરા

There are many *Jivas* which are *Sthavaras* or incapable of moving, there are others capable of moving. The categories are determined by the actions one has done. The variance is due to the individual karmas

ઝરાલ અગઓ જોગ યિજ્ઞાતમ પલેતિય
સવ્યે અવત્ત દુક્ષાય અઓ સર્જે અહિસિયા

A *Trasha Jiva* may be transformed into a *Sthavar* in the next life and also vice versa. Whether a *Jiva* is *Trasha* or *Sthavar* it makes no difference. All dislike affliction and there for injury to all should be avoided

अज्जत्थं सब्बजो सयं दिस्स पाणे पियायए
न हणे पाणिणो पाणे भय वेराजो उघरण

All feel their own pleasures and pains individually. All love their lives. So the lives of *Jivas* should not be interfered with. A man should not cause fear to others. He should keep himself aloof from all kinds of enmity.

Comprehensiveness of Jain Ahimsa

From what has been written above it will be seen that the Jain conception of *Ahimsa* is very comprehensive. Jain *Ahimsa* extends not only to human beings but goes beyond and embraces within its orbit not only the beasts, birds and insects but also the vegetable and the Earth, Water, Fire and Wind lives. *Ahimsa* may be called the basic principle of all religions but it is Jainism alone which can lay claim to have extended its horizon to all creations of the world. The principle of the sacredness of all lives has nowhere been respected with the same magnitude and comprehensiveness of heart as in Jainism.

Once *Lord Mahavira* addressed his audience and said "I ask you all, tell me whether you like happiness or pain? If your answer is that you dislike pain then take it from me that it is also the same with other beings." On other occasion he said "Suppose some body comes to you and asks you to hold in your hands a red hot iron-ball, will you do so? If you cannot be expected to hold it, how can you expect others to do it? If you do not like to be harshly treated, how do you think that others like to be so treated? Look into others as you would look to yourself." He has again said "As you would like to remain unmolasted so you should keep all others unmolasted. You should not kill any living beings and be kindly disposed to them all."

According to Jainism there are three causations

All actions are done by the instrumentality of mind body and speech. The Activities of mind, body and speech are called Yoga in Jainism. *Himsa* may be caused by any of the three instruments or by all or by any of them in conjunction with any of the other or others. When a man kills some body with the sword he is apparently causing *Himsa* by body. The injury caused by physical force is due to the activity of the instrument of body. When a man orders the killing of some body he apparently commits *Himsa* by word of mouth. The *Himsa* caused by mind though unperceivable may still be very violent in degree and more sinful than the one caused by the other two instruments. Various instances of *Himsa* of the Mind are found in Jain Literature which are not only very interesting but also greatly illuminating. At one time *Maharaj Srenila* was going in a procession on a visit to *Bhagavan Mahavira*. On the way he passed by the side of a great Rishi who was in deep meditation at that time. The Rishi was himself a great King before his initiation into monkhood. As the procession passed by his side the guards of the Emperor *Srenila* talked between themselves. 'see the fun of this Rishi. What a coward he is that he has left his empire to his young son and has taken recourse to this silent meditation'. Look how his kingdom is being snatched away from the hands of his son by that rival king that has invaded the Kingdom'. These words fell in the ears of the Rishi. He forgot that he was in meditation as a Sadhu and began to wage mental war with the foes of his son. He began to wave swords and other deadly weapons in the arena of mind for the time being he was in a pitched battle as if

he was fighting with actual enemies. By this time Srenika reached the *Lord Mahavira* and after paying him humble obeisance asked as to what future life would be obtained by the great Rishi, who was meditating so absorbingly. *Lord Mahavira* said "He would go to the meanest Hell". Emperor Srenika was quite amazed. *Lord Mahavira* satisfied his curiosity by answering that the Rishi was not at all in religious meditation but was deeply engrossed in a fierce battle in his mind. This explains what is mental *Himsa*. What is done by contemplation and mental manoeuvre is *Himsa* done by the instrument of mind. Jainism lays great emphasis on avoidance of all kinds of *Himsa* by mind, word and body or the combination of any two or more of them.

Actions are executed in three ways either by doing, or by getting done, or by supporting. When a person commits *Himsa* himself he performs it in the first way. When a person engages others to do some act of injury he commits it in the second way and when a person eulogises the injurious acts of others he commits it in the third way. *Himsa* may be caused by any one of these ways or by combination of two or more of them. Jainism enjoins the avoidance of *Himsa* in all its ways and by all means. Jainism preaches that the activities of the mind, body and speech in all these three ways are to be so controlled and restrained that no injury is caused to any living being. It is interesting to note that by combination and permutation of the three means and three ways of activities a total number of 49 kinds of activities are arrived at. Jainism enjoins non injury in all the 49 ways. In this connection the ordination of *Lord Mahavira*, the great votary of *Ahimsa* is as follows —

जगन्निस्सिण्हि भूण्हि तस्मानमहि धारोहि च
नो तेसिमारमे दद मणसा वयसा कायसा चेव

Whatever living beings there are in the world, whether of the moving or non moving class, should not be hurt in any of the ways viz mind, speech or body

जायस्ति एते पाणा नसा अदुवा धाररा
ते जाणमज्जाण या न हणे नो वि घायय

A person aspiring to attain liberation should not consciously or unconsciously kill any living being or cause others to kill them or eulogise killing by others

सय तियायय पाणे अदुवज्जनेहि घायय
हणन्त वाऽणुजाणाह येव यइदर अप्पणो

He who kills lives himself or causes another to kill or supports one who is killing, is simply gathering enmity towards himself

Jainism enjoins *Ahimsa* not only towards friendly beings but towards all beings whether friendly or enemical

समया सव भूणसु सत्तु मित्तेसु वा जणे ' It says the true principle of *Ahimsa* is to maintain a feeling of equanimity towards all beings whether friends or enemies

Jainism goes on further and says that *Ahimsa* should be maintained in all circumstances and at all places *Ahimsa* is not a virtue of convenience but it is a principle As a principle it should be hold sacred in all circumstances and uphold against all odds A true votary of *Ahimsa* should not grudge any sacrifice and should always think that nothing death can happen

"Tolerate living beings Do not kill them, though they eat your flesh and blood"—such is the teaching of *Lord Mahavira*. Though weakened and emaciated by hunger like the joint of a crow's leg, though overwhelmed with thirst in deserts, though trembling with severe cold and though confronted by scorching heat, a true votary of *Ahimsa* should not be vanquished and abstain from killing the vegetable, water, fire, earth and wind lives though his very existence be at stake

Thus it will be seen that *Ahimsa* as followed by the Jains is very comprehensive and all embracing. It is a sort of proclamation of fearlessness to the entire creation of beings. It is a bond of indemnity against all mal-treatment from one-self. It is a message of forgiveness and tolerance even to the deadly enemies. It is as spacious as the sky itself and as deep as the ocean. It is towards all, in all circumstances. It is as towards the ant, as towards the elephant and as towards the enemy, as towards the friend.

Jainism further teaches: "Treat the entire creation, be small or big, on all sides, like thy soul" "Be friendly towards all beings" "Avoid enmity towards all" "Be forbearing in your behaviour towards all" "All beings covet life and it is dear to all. None like death, all dread it. All beings desire happiness and abhor and dread pain. Thinking thus do not kill any living being." Thus Jain *Ahimsa* is a principle of universal love and fellow-feeling. It is brotherhood not only of man and man but men with beasts, birds, insects and whatever is embodied with life and consciousness. This principle of *Ahimsa* is being preached by Jainism from time immemorial. *Lord Rishab*, the First Tirthankar of the present Era, who has been a great Avatar and Avadhut.

Holy *Rig Veda* pierced this very thing to his 98 sons aspiring for Kingdom and converted them all into great Saints of *Ahimsa*. The 22nd *Tirthankar* of the Jains, the venerable *Lord Neminath* on account of his deep regard for this very principle of *Ahimsa* gave up his proposed marriage with *Rajmaly* the lovely lady of the *Bhog Lal* and setting aside all worldly ties became a pious monk to save himself from being instrumental in the killing of animals brought for marital feast. *Lord Tardman* the 21st *Tirthankar* of the Jains, own for himself the title of *Mahavir* a only by culture of this great and invincible force of *Ahimsa*. It was he who launched a strong revolt against animal sacrifice and achieved marvellous success in his mission. He was also called *Mahatma* (महत्त्वा)—a great saint on account of his large heartedness towards all beings, small or big. He devoted a period of more than 12 years to silent meditation and performance of austere *Tapas*. It was after this strenuous trial of years that he emerged out as a great Saint and apostle of *Ahimsa* and having attained *Keval Jnan* or the supreme knowledge was the most learned man of his time. He was called 'वेद्यन्त-वेद्य' "one who understands the pain of others" *अकसायमुक्त*—*अकसायमुक्त*—'one who is free from all passions' *अमयकरे*—'one who is an emblem of no fear to the entire existence'

Complete Ahimsa Is Practicable

People generally doubt if *Ahimsa* is at all a practical religion. *Mord Mahavir* proclaimed about 3000 years back that it was the eternal law—the real order of things for those who look to the welfare of their soul and there is nothing impracticable about it provided a man has the inner urge and faith alone which makes difficult things easy and makes what seems to the ordinary man only a theoretical

proposition Of course complete observance of *Ahimsa* requires great sacrifice For those who cannot make necessary sacrifice, it will always remain impracticable Greatness of sacrifice is no measure of impracticability If one cannot put forth the required efforts and pay the necessary price it is his incapacity It is quite true of *Ahimsa* as of other things to say "what one man has done others can do as well if the same amount of zeal, earnestness and efforts are forthcoming *Ahimsa* requires strenuous efforts and intermittent carefulness for its observance in all thoroughness

A desire of complete *Ahimsa* is required to make great sacrifices The conditions laid down are as follows —

1 All ties with family and home should be cut off All attachment should be cast off All worldly possessions must be given up

2 18 kinds of sins should be avoided

3 A life-long vow to observe *Ahimsa* in word, mind, and speech in all its aspects should be taken

4 Life long vow of not to tell falsehood, not to steal, not to indulge in sexual intercourse of any kind and not to possess any property should be simultaneously adopted

5 Body, mind, and speech should be kept under constant vigilance and control

6 Necessary activities should be conducted with utmost care and in an unflinching manner Life should be quite

7 Life should be sustained on lifeless food and drink.

8 Measured food and drink may be taken between sun rise and sun set and nothing should be stored over night

9 The essentials of bare existence should be obtained by innocent begging

10 Life should be made completely self dependant and even the help of public service like Post and Telegraphs, Railways or Airways should be abandoned

11 Long halts should not be made at any particular place and a wandering life should be led No Monasteries Maths or Shrines should be kept or erected

A person who is willing to renounce the world as stated above and puts forth all his energies for the observance of the rules of conduct will find that *Ahimsa* is no longer an impracticable religion to him. It may be asked 'the world is full of lives there is no place which is devoid of lives even according to Jains then how is it possible to lead a complete *Ahimsa* life. Lives are bound to be killed inspite of all renunciations and keenest observance of the rules of conduct" The answer is a very simple one. A man can be held responsible only for his actions but not for what happens to others. Death, birth and continuation of life are the laws of the Universe. *Jivas* are dying all around. New births are taking place every moment. Lives are seen existing all around. But a man is not responsible for all these. Death of a living being can not cast sins on a passer by nor can the peaceful life of a being make him meritorious. Cessation of life is no *Himsa* nor the continua

tion of life in *Himsa*. One who kills *Jivas* is *Himsak* and one who does not kill living beings is *Ahimsak*. A person, who makes all possible renunciation for the observance of *Ahimsa*, is ever vigilant in its observance, avoids all possible injuries to living beings, treats them all like his own soul and does not mind any sacrifice, discharges his responsibilities to the utmost and if *Jivas* are killed inspite of this he cannot be held responsible for the same. *Jivas* die by their own *Karmas* and also live by the same force. How can a man who is non injurious in mind, body and speech and in all his activities be held responsible for the death of some body which he did not bring about willingly or consciously? Such deaths are natural deaths and an *Ahimsak* can not be charged with any offence on that account. Lord Mahavira has said—

सद्य भूयप भूयस्स सम्म भूयाद् पासओ
विहिया सयस्स दन्तस्स पाव कम्म' न यन्थद्
जय चरे जय चिट्ठे जय आसे जय सय
जय भुञ्जस्सो भासन्तो पाव कम्म न यन्थद्

"One who looks upon all beings as his own soul, one who has stopped his *Asravas* or inlets of sin and one who is self-restrained is not bound with sins. Standing carefully, sitting carefully, sleeping carefully, eating carefully and speaking carefully a man is not bound by sins."

Once Lord Mahavira was asked what would be the consequences to a monk if eggs of a hen are crushed under his feet. Mahavira replied "if the *Ahimsak* monk is carefully walking no sins would attach to him". This answer was also with the same back-ground as stated above. The mensrea

for the crime of *Himsa* has been rightly set up above and a man is completely *Ahimak* if he cannot be charged with the same

In keeping with the the above principle and as an amplification of the same it has been said that a man who does not take the vow of non injury, who is careless in his activities and movements and who does not make necessary sacrifice for the observance of the principle of *Ahimsa* commits the offence of *Himsa* even though no lives have been killed. A military watchman who sleeps in the night and is not vigilant is guilty of offence even though no enemy raid has actually occurred. A cat may not be able to catch a mouse but it is cruel nevertheless as it is always after its hunt mentally. A person hates somebody and resolves, on an occasion offering, to kill him. Is he not a murderer simply because he is not finding opportunity to commit murder? Similarly a person who harbours evil propensities, thoughts, or intentions towards living beings is a murderer in relation to them. It is the self which is ultimately the wrongdoer. If a person does not renounce sins if he is accustomed to act harmfully, and if he is not careful in the operations of his mind, speech and body he commits the sin of *Himsa* even though no *Jiva* has been killed. Being unresigned and uncontrolled, he shows utter disregard for the lives of others day and night and is therefore committing *Himsa* every moment.

It may be argued here how is *Ahimsa* practicable to a householder when he has to give up all worldly ties and wealth for its observance. It is at the cost of all worldly enjoyment, so it is not practicable for mundane Souls. The

question is a very important one but it is based on a false sense and exaggerated value of the worldly life. What enjoyments there are in the worldly life to a person who looks to the realities of things and chalks out a way for the permanent good of the Soul? The worldly enjoyments are not permanent. When they are not willingly abandoned they abandon the man in due course and leave a great agony in the mind behind. You cannot give up eating betel nuts but what happens when teeth are no more? You cannot give up cinemas and theatres but what happens when you are blinded by irony of fate? You cannot make charity of your wealth but what happens when a tragedy like that of Quetta or that of Noakhali or Bihar happens? You always think of your wife and children but what happens when you happen to die before them? After all, the worldly pleasures and enjoyments are quite transitory and fleeting. They are sensual and not natural and as such not at all of intrinsic value. The world relations are also of temporary character. *Ahimsa* is supreme virtue having greatest intrinsic value in the uplift of the soul. It gives ever lasting peace and tranquility to the Soul. It is panacea for all social discords and conflicts. It is something like a rocky shelter in the midst of the miseries of the world. It is the purity of Soul and nobleness of feeling. It is the purest of meditations. It removes hostility and fosters universal brotherhood. Lord Mahatma has very nicely said "*Ahimsa* is freedom from all miseries. It is the true sacrifice of all sacrifices. It is the abode of the liberated ones and the throne of the enlightened. To those who aspire for happiness of the Soul, *Ahimsa* to them is like sky to the birds, water to the thirsty, bread to the hungry, boat to the drowning, medicine to the sick and a guide to lost ones in the woods". If *Ahimsa* is an essential virtue

for permanent good of the Soul then the sacrifice involved for its observance should never be taken as too great. *Ahimsa* requires simply willing abandonment of transitory pleasures and short lived relations of the world—pleasures and relations which a man is forced to abandon against his will under the compulsion of Karmic law. Is this sacrifice too great? Hitler sacrificed the best men and materials for wreaking vengeance on his enemies. Why should not any one be competent to sacrifice his petty pleasures for the complete observance of *Ahimsa*? Lord Mahavira has said that as the razor cuts on its sharpness and the wheel moves on its orbit, similarly wise men base their lives on stern realities of things. Men are born for the culture of religion only.

Ahimsa and House-holder

It may be asked if it is not too much to expect such complete renunciation from every person. There may be persons who choose to live as house-holders. What is the path chalked out for them in Jainism? What is *Ahimsa* of the weak? This question is also very important and I may attempt a short answer here.

There is no disappointment even for a house holder in Jainism. What is *Ahimsa*? It is self restraint (अहिंसा निजना दिष्टा सत्य भूपसु सत्तमो) and abstention from sins (उपरओ सत्य भूपसु) against living beings. This abstention may be complete or partial as the case may be. When it is complete, it is full *Ahimsa* and when it is partial, it is restricted *Ahimsa*. A house holder has the choice to adopt *Ahimsa* of a restricted scope. He may try and determine to be Non violent to the extent of his capacity. As for example if a layman

thinks that he has not the moral strength to remain non-injurious when assaulted, it is his choice to take the vow of not killing innocent moving beings. This is restricted *Ahimsa*.

Jainism says that *Ahimsa* is always beneficial whatever may be the extent to which it is adopted. Nectar is beneficial even if it is taken in small quantity. In whatever sphere of life a man may be, he is capable of observing *Ahimsa* to some extent or other. The Scheme of Jain *Ahimsa* is such that every body may find scope to practise it according to his capacity. Even at the risk of being lengthy I describe the Scheme in some detail here.

Ahimsa should be the guiding principle of every human being. Every body should abstain from all kinds of injury in all its aspects. One who does not find himself sufficiently capable of observing complete *Ahimsa*, he should practise it as far as possible. He should at least take the vow as follows —

1. I shall not kill intentionally any innocent living being of the moving species nor shall I cause another to do so by mind, speech and body.

He should in particular avoid the following acts —

- (1) Beating and chastisement of living beings,
- (2) Mutilating or castrating,
- (3) Tying up or entrapping living beings,
- (4) Overloading, and
- (5) Withholding food and drink

2 To speak lies is also a sin against beings. Falsehood should be completely abstained. One who cannot avoid falsehood completely, he should at least avoid gross falsehood *e.g.* giving false evidence or appropriation of others property

He should in particular avoid the following acts —

- (1) Falsely accusing others ,
- (2) Disclosing secrets ,
- (3) Betraying the confidence of one's wife ,
- (4) Giving sinful advices , and
- (5) Execution of false documents or forgery

3 To steal others properties is also *Himsa*. Wealth and property are as dear as one's own life. One should completely abstain from all kinds of stealing and take nothing which is not given by the owner. One who cannot abstain from stealing completely he should at least give up gross stealing *e.g.* burglary, house breaking, pocket picking, dacoity and such other offences pertaining to property of others

He should in particular avoid the following Acts —

- (1) Purchase of stolen articles ,
- (2) Aiding and abetting stealing ,
- (3) Illegal Traffic ,
- (4) Use of false weights and measures , and
- (5) Adulteration and dealing in adulterate products

4 Sexual intercourse is also an act of *Himsa*. Innumerable lives are killed in the process of generation. Carnal desire is in itself *Himsa*. One should completely abstain from all kinds of sexual intercourse and sexual

pleasures in its entirety. But one who is a householder, he should at least give up all kinds of adultery and be contented with one's own wife. Excessive indulgence with one's own wife should also be shunned.

He should in particular avoid the following acts —

- (1) Indulgence with any keep or concubine,
- (2) Indulgence with a widow, unmarried women or *apros* etc,
- (3) Unnatural indulgence,
- (4) Contracting marriages and sexual relations,
- (5) Excessive sexual indulgence

5 Possession of property is due to greed and attachment to worldly pleasures and as such is *Ahimsa*. One should completely abstain from all attachment, external or internal. One who is a householder and cannot abstain from possession altogether he should at least abstain from too much possession of the following groups of properties — (a) Land and House properties, (b) Gold and Silver, (c) Other valuables and Grains, (d) Beasts—Bipeds and Quadrupeds, and (e) Other household furniture. This is possible by a limitation of the quantity and number of the articles for use.

6 There are *Jivas* all around and in all directions. Sins are committed against all these *Jivas* in ten directions, in various ways. As a Householder adopts only limited vows, great scope is left for the commission of sins not covered by his restricted vows. To narrow down and limit the scope, a vow called the *Dig Vrata* is enjoined. A householder should limit his movements in all directions. This is something like putting a space-limit to activities and

consequently giving up *Himsa* completely outside a particular space-limit. This can be easily practised by a little attention and carefulness.

7 There are innumerable material objects of enjoyments, some may be used repeatedly and others only ones. *Himsa* is caused in the enjoyment of all these material objects. There are 26 categories of these objects. A man should avoid the enjoyment of these all in all completeness but a householder who cannot do so, should limit the number or quantity of the articles to be used by him. This can be done for a day or for a fixed period. This narrows down the fifth vow of partial renunciation of attachment or possession and intensifies the spirit of *Ahimsa*.

There are *Fifteen* varieties of Business enterprises mentioned in Jain Scriptures such as those involving great use of fire, cutting of trees plants etc, making carts etc, castrating bullocks, clearing of Jungles by employment of fire and drying up lakes rivers etc. These fifteen varieties of Business enterprises involve great injury to living beings and should be avoided by all laymen.

8 There are various mental dispositions and propensities which cause *Himsa* without any return whatsoever. These mental *Himsas* and *Himsa* caused by carelessness should be avoided to strengthen the vow of *Ahimsa*. Hankering after unobtained pleasures or anxiety for preserving the obtained ones and evil motives and designs are all *Apadhyan* involving *Himsa* for no self-interest. To keep utensils containing oil etc, open and without lid is causing *Himsa* due to carelessness. One also commits *Himsa* by distribution

of weapons of death like Bombs, Lathis and other armaments. Sinful advice is also *Himsa* for no self-interest. A layman should abstain from all these.

9 The life of a complete votary of *Ahimsa* is devoid of all sinful activities. Every man should culture a completely pious and sinless life but if a householder finds it difficult he should, at least, for a period of 48 minutes, take the vow of avoidance of sinful activities and try to repeat it as many times a day as possible. This daily prayer and meditation of 48 minutes makes a person realise the importance of a life long vow to avoid all sinful activities. This is, in a sense a time limit to the commission of *Himsa* not covered by other vows. The status of a layman during the period of the vow, though to a lesser degree and extent, is very near to that of a complete *Ahimsak*.

10 To intensify the restrictive vows of abstinence from possession and moving outside a particular area, a layman should observe the vow known as *DESAVAKASIKA VRAT*. This vow is a further limitation of the sixth and seventh vows. The general lifelong limitation of the area of movement or action is further narrowed down for a smaller period of a day. Similarly the objects of use are further limited for that day and they are not used outside the limited area determined by this vow. In this way the scope of *Ahimsa* is broadened and it goes on occupying greater and greater importance in the life of the house-holder.

11 Eleventh rule of conduct which a layman is to observe is complete fasting from sunrise to sunrise and passing the night on lifeless ground on a simple and secluded bedding.

and devoting oneself to meditation and atonement of sins. In this vow complete *Brahmacharya* has got to be observed and the natural calls are performed, if necessary, at spots which are inspected and pre determined. This also intensifies the vow of *Ahimsa* for that day.

12 Various kinds of foods and eatables are prepared in a layman's house. A layman is required to offer his food, and drink, medicines and other articles of use and in ones possession to a fully renunciated monk. This willing donation of one's articles to pure Sadhus saves him from the sin which have been entailed, if he had used the same for his own nourishment and comforts.

It will be seen from a careful study of the above vows as to how the life of a House holder has been tried to be made more and more *Ahimsa* and how by an unconscious and deeply thought of process the various injurious activities have been taken off the life of a Jain layman. The principle of *Ahimsa* is deep rooted in all the vows. Every vow deeply inculcates the idea of non injury and self restraint. They are valuable rules of discipline and religious benevolence. They teach at every step to be more and more *Ahimsa*.

Ahimsa an uncompromisable Virtue

It may be said that Jainism preaches restricted *Ahimsa* in case of house holders and as such sanctions *Himsa* to some extent or other. The reply is emphatic "No". Jainism never sides with *Himsa*. It does not compromise the principle of *Ahimsa* under any circumstances. It explains its intention by a story as old as *Mahavira* himself. There was a King who arrested five persons for a particular crime. The father

of the arrested persons was very much concerned to learn the arrest of his sons. He went to the King and began to beseech him to release his sons and not to hang them up. The King was not willing. Thereupon the father insisted on release at least of four of them and then of three, then of two and at last requested the king to release at least one of them. Can it be said that the father was hostile towards any of his sons in getting the one released? In the same way Jainism insists on non injury to all beings but to one who cannot give up injury to all beings it says "please give up *Ahimsa* of the innocent ones at least". It does not support hostility to others in the least. The behaviour of life which is not injurious to living beings in any of the ways is called self restraint. One who is self-restrained in body, mind and speech in all these ways is *Ahimsak* in its fullest sense. One who is not so fully restrained but is restrained only to a certain extent or towards certain *Jivas* only is called restricted *Ahimsa*. He is *Ahimsak* to the extent to which he observes non-injury and *Ahimsa* in respect of other sinful activities. The unrestrained part of a house-holder's life is not at all commendable according to Jainism. A man imposes upon himself the restriction of not hunting any fish. He does not satisfy his wants by means of fishes. He is therefore controlled so far as fishes are concerned and is *Ahimsak* in that respect. But he meets his wants by means of vegetable bodies in general. With regard to them he is uncontrolled and unrestrained and therefore sinful. Similarly he is hostile to other beings in respect of whom he has not renounced the sins. A fraction is always a part of the whole and similarly partial *Ahimsa* of the house holder leading as it does to the complete *Ahimsa* is always wholesome. Jainism does not recognise

Himsa in the least. It recognises partial *Ahimsa* as much as it is a species of *Ahimsa*

Unchangable Definition of Ahimsa

A Fisherman has to hunt fishes to eke out his livelihood. A cultivator has to grow and cut the harvest to support himself and his family. How can these acts be described as violent when they are essential for the very existence of life!

So far as the Principle of *Ahimsa* is concerned it will remain the same for all and for ever. It cannot be altered and varied to suit the convenience or sweet will of the person concerned. It is a determined thing just like a yard which cannot be shortened or lengthened with each customer. The measure must remain constant otherwise it can serve no purpose. If *Ahimsa* is an eternal truth its conception must be determined and unvarying. The definition of Geometrical line must remain the same whether the case is of a young boy unable to draw any but thick lines or a skilled artist competent to draw the finest ones reaching to a approximate perfection. There can be no two definitions of *Ahimsa*. There are infinite cases to meet and the definition of *Ahimsa* cannot be varied to meet these infinite cases. However, there is no disappointment even for such persons like Fisherman etc in Jainism. Even such persons may be *Ahimsaks* to a certain extent. A Fisherman may take vow not to hunt more than a fixed number of fishes a day or to hunt in particular waters only. A Cultivator may similarly impose upon himself the restriction of acreage of land to be sown. He may take vow not to sow other than a particular variety of corn. In this way every person can cultivate *Ahimsa* in his own sphere of life. Jainism does not allow to call a life

religious when it is really sinful. Jainism does not recognise circumstances in life as justifying *Himsa*. It gives the true perspective of things. It says "see and believe things as they are". If you are a fisherman you should know that you are committing *Himsa* in hunting fish and the plea of support of the family is no justification. If you are a cultivator you must know that you are committing *Himsa* in tilling the land and in harvesting corn and the argument that cultivation is necessary for supporting the nation will not turn the sinful act into an act of *Ahimsa*. A Doctor may come forward and say animal experimentation and vivisection is necessary to find out new medicines for the welfare of humanity and therefore there is no *Himsa* in killing animals for research in medical science. Some body will come out and say that animal sacrifice is necessary to propitiate gods and therefore there is no *Himsa* in killing goats for the purpose. Some will say it is necessary for the establishment of Pakistan to kill Hindus and Hindus will also say the vice-versa. But an act of *Himsa* cannot be converted into that of *Ahimsa* simply by ascribing to it some motive or other. Whatever may have been your motive if you are not self-restrained and *Ahimsah* in your mode of life, you are *Himsah* and sinful. Jainism regards *Ahimsa* in renunciation of *Himsa*. It does not call *Himsa* meritorious simply because you happen to have some reason or circumstances which prohibit you from giving up your calling or so called philanthropic work for the cause of humanity. Jainism does not look to the circumstances of the person and his environments but regards an act of violence and unrestraint towards creatures as a sinful act in all cases.

Self defence is regarded as an exonerating circumstances under the criminal law, what does Jainism say about it?

Jainism does not distinguish between a foe and a friend. It lays emphasis on alike treatment towards an enemy and a friend. "समया सय भुषसु सतु मित्तसु वा जगे।" It says culture a spirit of fellowship towards all "मेत्तिभूषहि कप्पय" Do not be Vindictive towards any living being "न विहसिजेज्ज वेणइ" It will thus be seen that Jainism does not give moral support to killing even for self-defence. On the otherhand it preaches that forbearance is the highest virtue (तितिक्षा धर्म) and enjoins that even when assulted a votary of *Ahimsa* should not feel annoyed but should bear all tortures very calmly. It teaches that soul is imperishable. Body and Soul are distinct. Annihilation of the body is not annihilation the Soul. It says 'no matter whether body remains or perishes, Soul should be protected and religion should be preserved'. Innumerable instances are there, where Jain Heroes have sacrificed their lives for the noble principle of *Ahimsa*. *Gajusukhmal* a relation of *Srikrishna* was betrothed to the daughter of one *Somal*. Just a few days before marriage, *Gajusukhmal* got himself initiated at the feet of *Tirthankar Aris Nem* and soon after initiation took to holy meditation near a crematory. *Somal*, the would be father in law, was very much annoyed at it and placed burning charcoals from pyre near by on the head of *Muni Gajusukhmal*, who was in deep meditation. The whole body was burnt to Ashes but *Muni Gajusukhmal* did not break his meditation. remained quite calm and composed, and did not retaliate the cruel *Somal*. Another instance is that of *Muni Khandal* whose skin was striped off with razor yet he did not even scream a sigh from his mouth and allowed himself to be killed for the sake of his Soul. The instance

of self-immolation at the altar of *Ahimsa* are too numerous to be recorded here.

On occasions of assault, aggression or danger to life, the only path open to a *Ahimsak* is to depend upon persuasiveness. It is only by change of heart that *Ahimsak* may seek to save himself. The beautiful *Lady Rajmati*, who initiated herself into the holy order of Sadhus, after *Aristhanemi* the 22nd *Tirthankar* gave up his intention to marry her, happened to make a short halt in a cave on a rainy day. *Rathnemi*, the elder brother of *Aristhanemi* was also a Sadhu and he was staying in that very cave. *Rajmati* did not notice him and spread her clothes to dry them up. *Rathnemi*, seeing *Rajmati* naked began to induce her to love him. There was no protection for *Rajmati*. She quickly folded her arms over her breast and sat down. *Rajmati* saw that *Rathnemi's* strength of will was broken and temptation had got the better of him. But she did not lose courage and began to address *Rathnemi* in most heroic words. —“I should have no desire for you even if you were *Vaisramana* in beauty. Fie upon you famous knight, who want to lick the vomited food for the sake of this transitory life. To you death is honourable than life. Both of us are born in noble families. Let us firmly practise self-control. If you fall in love with any woman you see, you will be like a Hada tree that can be uprooted by a gust of wind. He cannot be said to be a *Tyagi* in its true sense, who does not find pleasure in garments, women and bed simply because he has not got them. He alone is a real *Tyagi* who turns his back even towards enjoyments at his disposal.” Having heard these well-spoken words *Rathnemi* returned to his

senses like an elephant driven by the hook. Thus the pious lady, *Rajmati*, true to self control and her vows, was successful in defending herself and maintained the honour of her clan and family and her own chastity by change of the heart of *Rathnem*.

Another very interesting instance is that of layman *Sudarshan*. He was a layman disciple of *Lord Mahavira* and was a resident of the famous city of *Rajgraha*. Outside the skirts of *Rajgraha* lived a gardener named *Arjunaka*. Gardener's wife's name was *Bandumati*. One day *Bandumati* was attacked by some wealthy young man of *Rajgraha*, who violated her chastity. From that day the Gardener *Arjunaka* became a very cruel man. The ghost of violence was in him in full rampant and he began to kill six men and one woman every day by his club. *Maharaj Srenika*, king of *Rajgraha* heard of this and warned the people by beat of drums not to go outside the city lest they may be killed. Once *Lord Mahavira* happened to come to that side and stayed in *Gunshilak Chaitya* outside the skirts of *Rajgraha*. *Sraval Sudarshan* heard of this and resolved to go to that part of the city to pay his respectful homage to *Lord Mahavira* and would not desist in spite of all requests from all kiths and kins. Alone he went out of the city. As soon as he was perceived by the *Arjunaka* he began to wave his *Mugdar* and ran towards *Sudharshan* to kill him. *Sudharshan* was not a bit nervous. He chose a small spot for himself and folded his hands together in prayer and uttered 'My salutation to the *Arahats* and *Siddhas*. My salutation to *Lord Mahavira*, the Saviour of the world. I was so long observer of the

restricted vows, now you as my witness I take upon myself the fuller vows I renounce the 18 kinds of sins and give up all kinds of food and drink. If I survive this ordeal I shall have option to terminate my determination to fast unto death. If I do not survive I shall stick to my determination till the last moment." Having made this firm resolve *Sudarshan* stood in silent meditation. *Arjuna* was simply amazed at this calm posture. He stood dumb-founded and could not attack *Sudarshan*. He simply stared at his face as if he was drawing a contrast between his cruel life and the calm and serene life of *Sri Aval Sudarshan*. He was so much impressed by the calmness that prevailed on the face of *Sri Aval Sudarshan* that the Ghost in him was out and he fell down senseless on the ground with club off. *Sri Aval Sudarshan* was out of danger. His vow having been fulfilled, was terminated automatically. *Arjuna* recovered his senses a little while later and accompanied *Sri Aval Sudarshan* to pay his homage to *Lord Mahavira*. He was so much impressed by the preaching of *Lord Mahavira* that he adopted the life of a full *Ahimsa*. His life was then an ideal one. People used to stone him, beat and kick him as the old murderer but *Sadhu Arjuna* would not even utter a single word in protest. He would calmly forbear all these tortures. A cruel murderer was thus converted into a staunch votary of *Ahimsa*. It was only by change of heart that *Sri Aval Sudarshan* was able to save himself in the worst of circumstances.

Ahimsa and Women

A question may be asked—what to do when persuasiveness is of no avail? How can a woman protect her chastity in such circumstances?

The question is a very grave one. To succum to live a life of shame is cowardice and to resort to violence for self protection is also cowardice as it shows a lack of faith in the efficacy of Ahimsa. Then how to get out of this Dilemma? The answer is quite simple "Die for the sake of thy religion. Do not succum. Do not resort to violent retaliation but be prepared for a calm death and look to meditation and prayer as the only saviours. Allow thy self to be killed in silent meditation. If the assailant is aggressive and bent upon doing mischief abandon thy body in an innocent way and thus make futile all attempts of the aggressor." It is interesting to note that *Lord Mahavira* has prescribed that in these circumstances a *Sadhvi* may strangle herself to death rather than allow herself to be violated. In fact *Jain Nuns* may use strings with them for strangling themselves if any occasion arises at all.

Cannot a lay woman use weapons in self defence? Nuns are under vows of complete *Ahimsa*. They cannot take recourse to any kind of force much less to sword or dagger for their protection. Lay women are in different circumstances. Why should not they use weapons for safe guarding their person?

As cowardliness is no virtue for Nuns so also it is not for lay women. They should not succum themselves to any assault much less to injury to their chastity. If they have to choose between cowardice or shameful life and violence let them not choose the first one. When the choice is between violence and non violence let them not be violent. Remember that violence is also no guarantee for self protection. It is a relative term. Of what avail can violence be against violence.

when the aggressive side is more stronger, or better equipped or put in better circumstances or have pre planned designs. It is only a pious chivalry which can save one's honour in odd circumstances. The tragedies of Noakhali and Bihar would not have been so painful if women there would have played their part well and instead of succumbing would have given up their lives for the sake of their honour. *Ahimsa* is the only invincible force or weapon for an otherwise ill equipped victim. Self protection must come from within. It must not in any circumstances be allowed to depend on outward strength. Protective weapons may be snatched but the moral force and will not to allow oneself to be molested in any circumstances always remain self-protected. It is a perennial source of strength which cannot be snatched or detached. Moral strength of womanhood is the greatest and the most invincible force which can protect its honour in all circumstances.

Of course when a lay woman is under the restricted vow of *Ahimsa*, she has for her choice the path of counter attacks as well. It is for her to decide to take to violence or not. It is true that even if she decides to take to violent methods it does not mutilate her vow as it is only to refrain from killing innocent beings. But Jainism specifically points out at the same time that an act which does not break a vow cannot be taken as tantamounting to support it. An act may be sinful even without doing any violence to the vow. Only that act is sinless which supports the vow or intensifies the same. Looking from this view point, the act of killing even an aggressor cannot be countenanced and called meritorious. It is always sinful as it is not an specie of *Ahimsa* but only an expression of disability or

weakness of the soul within to act non violently in certain circumstances

Ahimsa and Protection

The question of protection of others is also allied to the question of self defence, as the former is only an amplification of the latter. Self defence when spoken in relation to others is protection. What is the duty of a person when he is confronted with the problem of protection of others?

I shall attempt a brief reply to this question as well. The question will be best understood if it is split up into four parts viz (1) when the protected and the protector are both complete *Ahimsa*, (2) when the protected is not fully *Ahimsa* but the protector is fully so, (3) when the protected is fully *Ahimsa* but the protector is not so, and (4) when the protector is partially *Ahimsa* and the protected is also so

(1) In the first case as the protector is fully *Ahimsa* he cannot take recourse to violence without breaking the first great vow of non injury to all. However pious the life of the protected person may be, it should not be protected by doing violence to one's own vow. The sanctity of vow should be maintained at all costs. This is the preaching of Jainism. We may cite here two instances from Jain scriptures to make our view point more clear. *Mahavira* was still in his formative period. He had not yet acquired *Keval Jnan* or supreme knowledge. In this state of his monk life he was accompanied by one *Gosala*, who afterwards turned out to be his great rival. He was very mischievous and on account of his mischievous activity was instrumental in arousing a great recluse into rage

The recluse possessed the faculty of *Tejo Labdh*—the power to burn objects upto a certain distance *Lord Mahavira* possessed the counter power called the *Shital Labdh* and he used this power to protect *Gosala* from being burnt to ashes. Commenting on this incident saint *Bhikari*, a great apostle and thinker of the 19th Century, has said "This was a faulty step taken by *Mahavira*. At that time *Mahavira* was possessed of all the eight *Karmas*. He was still in a formative state and was under the influence of all *Karmic* forces and it is no wonder if he went stray." Another incident happened in the life time of the very *Tirthankar* after he had attained the supreme knowledge. This time *Lord Mahavira* did not use the counter-power and kept himself aloof. He did not try to protect his two pious Sadhus by use of force. *Raichand Bhas*, a great Jain philosopher, commenting on this incident has said at one place—"Had *Lord Mahavira* used his psychic power for the protection of his Sadhus he would have had to take another birth." This will at once show how the use of force for protection of others is disregarded by Jains as sinful. It is thus apparent that according to Jainism a Sadhu cannot protect another Sadhu when being attacked by a wild beast by killing or using any other force against it. Similarly he cannot protect a Sadhvi, from the attacks of a licentious person by doing away with him. He can only preach religion and in case it fails to influence, he would leave the Sadhvi to die a brave and heroic death and would exhort her to remain firm and not to give up her religion in any circumstances. It is said

अहिंसा भगवतो अहियं च हियं च न विद्म किंचि
 वारंति वास्यति यः, घित्त्वा जगत् वला हत्ये

'*Arhat Bhagvans* never use any force to desist people from what is harmful to them nor do they use it to persist them to do what is beneficial to them. They never forcibly hold hands and guide people but simply preach (उपम पुन न दिति) what is beneficial and of permanent good."

A person who maintains perfect equanimity of mind in such exciting circumstances is regarded as having observed non violence in its true spirit. A person who fails to maintain mental equilibrium and show feelings of affection towards the victim or feelings of hatred towards the assailant is called the transgressor of the vow of *Ahimsa*. Saint *Bhicans*, the great votary of *Ahimsa*, while explaining the discourses of *Lord Mahavira*, the great hero of non violence has remarked at more than one place that the feeling of love or attachment and hatred or disgust are both violence in disguise and a true lover of *Ahimsa* should save himself from both kinds of feelings. There is a very interesting story on the point. There was a renowned *Jain Monk* namely *Muni Skhandak* who had 500 monk disciples under his leadership. When *Skhandak* was a house holder he was a great debtor and was successful in defeating another great philosopher of his time. This philosopher was attached to some King. After *Skhandak* become monk he happened to stay in a garden of that King and the philosopher now found opportunity to take revenge. He managed to put deadly weapons underground in the garden and poisoned the mind of the king that the monks were doctors in disguise. The king on investigation found the weapons underground and believing the philosopher to be true, ordered him to execute all the sadhus to death. One by one 199 sadhus were put in an oil crusher and squeezed to death before the very eyes of

Skhandak *Skhandak* was quite unmoved even at this terrible slaughter. As each *Sadhu* was being taken to the crusher, he was instructing him to remain non-violent and not to entertain even hostile thoughts in mind. All the *Sadhvas* faced the situation very calmly and died without the least thought of enmity towards the philosopher. Now came the turn of the last disciple. He was quite young. The idea of his death moved *Skhandak* and taking pity on him, he began to beseech the philosopher for mercy. But as the latter did not pay heed to his request he got angry and began to curse the philosopher. After all *Skhandak* was also put into the crusher but he could not recoup his mental equilibrium and was killed, when he was full of agony and wrath towards the philosopher. Now it has been said in *Jain* scriptures that *Skhandak* was a *Biradhak* i.e. one who did not observe the vow of *Ahimsa* in its true sense, and his disciples were *Aradhak* as they observed it in its true spirit. There was attachment in the heart of *Skhandak* which caused him to be unequal towards his enemy and thus he fell down from his great vow of *Ahimsa*. It has been said in *Jain* Scriptures

सद्य जग त् समयाणुपेदी
 पियमपिय रुस्सइ णा करेज्जा
 जो समो सद्य भूणसु
 तस्स सामास्य होइ

“Look at beings with equanimity ; Do not be favourable to some body and inimical to others. One who is equally behaved to all beings is verily the true observer of religion of abstinence from all sins”

It is of these instructions contained in the *Jain* scriptures that a *Jain* monk has to keep himself quite aloof from violence or force of any kind and even in the gravest of situations he cannot take recourse to them for the protection of his brother monk or even a nun. He has been taught to cultivate a spirit of non violence even against the worst form of aggressor and death to him is not defeat if the vow of non-violence is preserved. For him vanquished is he who falls from his vow in critical moments and not one who sacrifices his life for its sake. His is the greatest victory who dies for the cause of *Ahimsa*.

People will say how can a non violent person see barbarities committed before his eyes? He must interfere to protect the weaker in the combat. This is the practical side of *Ahimsa*. Otherwise how is *Ahimsa* an active force?

Jainism makes it clear that perpetration of barbarities before one's eyes does not make one sinful provided he does not countenance it. To co operate with aggressor is also violence according to *Jainism*. It lays greatest emphasis on non cooperation with *Himsa* and the entire strength of *Ahimsa* lies in this spirit of non co operation. It is quite difficult, if not impossible, to change the heart of man and make him see wrong in his deeds by use of force and unless the heart is changed the barbarity exists. Is it possible to stop barbarity without mental change? So long as the seed exists, the tree cannot be said to have been uprooted. It is with this frame of mind that *Jainism* preaches complete calmness of mind even in most exciting circumstances. It touches to throw moral influence of the purest character and where it fails to act, *Jainism* is of opinion that physical force cannot be of

any avail. It is a matter of every day occurrence that application of force towards a cruel person always fosters bitterness in his mind. To engender feelings of hatred, anger or wrath by use of force is itself violence and a votary of complete *Ahimsa* cannot be a party to commission of *Himsa* in any form. It has been said “सरिसो होई बालाण तम्हा भिन्न न सजले”—“one who fights anger with anger is himself in the category of the fallen and fools”. To resist force with force is to put Ghee in burning fire. Fire of Anger can be quenched only by calmness of mind. ‘उद्यसमेण हणे कोह’—‘Conquer anger by amity’—is the commandment of Lord Mahavira. There can be affinity only between unlikes. “Likes repel, unlikes attract”. This is not only a law which governs the physical world but also applies in the field of human psychology. To eradicate violence, non-violence is the only remedy. Blood stains cannot be removed by blood—“लोही स्युः सरडयो पीताम्बर लोही स्युः केन धुपाये रे ?” Barbarism and blood-shed cannot be eradicated by barbarism and blood shed in its turn.

Ahimsa is fight against evil propensities. This fight is invisible but its value cannot be underrated only for that. An *Ahimsak* may be quite passive so far as outer foes are concerned but he is ever vigilant and active in eradicating the inner foes. Thus *Ahimsa* is quite potential. It is the greatest fighting force against all evils. Whoever handles this weapon of *Ahimsa* has to remain ever-active in his life. It is only on account of this vehement struggle involved in the internal battle that it has been called the highest victory—‘परमो ज्ञानो’.

(2) Now let us come to the second case where the protector is a complete *Ahimsa* but the protected is either partially *Ahimsa* or not at all so A mouse is being attacked by a cat, a fly is caught in a spider's web what should a complete non violent person do? The question of change of heart does not arise here

The answer is quite simple and easily deducible from what has already been discussed in detail above. It is no *Ahimsa* to smite one and protect the other. If the cat is starved to death and the mouse is saved it is only shifting the incidence. Sympathy on one side coincides with apathy on the other. The religion of votary of *Ahimsa* is to remain indifferent in such circumstances. He has no right to save one at the cost of another. Why should he cause starvation to the cat and the spider and save the mouse and the fly at their cost? Why should he be so concerned for the one and not at all for the other? Why should there be any distinction between the lives of different beings in the eyes of a non violent person? "He should be the protector of all and cruel to none" — (विदिया सवस्त । तिविदेण ताया । नय वितासप पर) This is the preaching of Lord Mahavira then why should he be inequitable?

It may be argued that intention is the main thing. In the above instances the intention is to protect the mouse or the fly and not at all to cause starvation to the cat or the spider? Then why should these acts be treated as act of violence?

The answer is very simple. Saint Bhicaji has very wittingly remarked "A man had a sword. He put it on the

throat of a man and began to move it to and fro. When he was asked not to kill the person he remarked 'I am not killing the man. I am simply testing the sharpness of the sword'. Is not this man a murderer? Similarly, whatever may be the intention, one who causes the starvation of the cat or the spider is a sinner."

A question may arise. Suppose a person is distributing corns among famine-stricken people and the distributor asks a votary of *Ahimsa* as to what he thinks of his action. Whether it is meritorious or sinful? What should be the reply of the votary of *Ahimsa*?

A votary of *Ahimsa* is sometimes on the horns of a dilemma. He is sometimes between two fires. Lord *Mahavira* has specifically instructed that a votary of *Ahimsa* should keep himself silent on such occasions. He should not say that it is a meritorious act because it is his duty to see that he does not consent to the killing of any being whether moving or not moving. Similarly he should not say that the act is sinful because he would then be instrumental in preventing the distribution of alms to the hungry people. Those who praise the gift are accessory to the killing of corn life. Those who forbid it deprive others of the means of subsistence. A votary of *Ahimsa* should keep himself silent and save himself from being exposed to sin either way.

There is a charming story in *Panchatantra* which beautifully depicts the *Jain* theology and for making our view-point more clear we quote the same here.

"Three *Sadhus* were performing austerities on the bank of a river. They acquired marvellous power on account of

their austere penances and their bowls & blankets became fixed in the sky. A crane came there and stood with one leg on the earth and the other uplifted as if in meditation. Soon a fish was seen and the crane picked it up with his beak. At this sight one of the *Sadhus* began crying out "Protect! Protect the fish!" No sooner these words were uttered the bowls and blanket of the *Sadhu* fell down from the sky. The austere life was destroyed.

The second *Sadhu* saw this and thought that as the first *Sadhu* asked to protect the fish, his psychic power was lost so attempt should be made to see that the fish is not protected. Having thought this he began to shout—"do not save the fish—do not save it!" As soon as these words were uttered his bowl and blanket also fell down.

The third *Sadhu* saw this and thought it is harmful to try either way. Let me remain neutral. Having thought this he kept himself absorbed in meditation. His bowl and blanket remained fixed in the sky as before."

The substance is one who does not get himself interested in act of sympathy or apathy his religion lives permanently and one who loses his equanimity by engaging himself in the activity of protecting or not protecting he loses his religion too. *Saint Bhicaji* has very nicely said —

"There can be no piety in acts involving *Himsa* and no *Himsa* in acts involving piety. As Sun and shadow are different so also the sinful acts and the meritorious acts are different.

Ahimsa to be a virtue must be unadulterated with *Himsa*. As the East and West i.e. two directions cannot meet, in the same way mercy is where there is no *Himsa*.

The entire citadel of *Jainism* is built on mercy. Those who seek after truth will find ample evidence on the point. If merit accrues out of acts of violence then Ghee must also be expected to come out of churning the water."

(8) Now we come to the third case where the protector is partially *Ahimsak* and the protected is completely *Ahimsak*.

Even in this case the basic principles to be applied are the same. Even for the protection of a complete observer of *Ahimsa*, if recourse is taken to *Himsa* it is sinful and not at all meritorious. No protection is meritorious which is not in keeping with the religious principles of a complete votary of *Ahimsa* and which slackens, the spirit of complete renunciation. Suppose a *Sadhu* is thirsty and is on the verge of death. Being a complete *Ahimsak* he cannot partake of living water. If some body comes and offers him such water to drink he cannot be called non-violent as he is causing death to water-lives and also inducing the *Sadhu* to fall from his vow of complete *Ahimsa*. Similarly if any one erects a house, monastery, shrine or temple for the residence of a *Sadhu* or devotee of complete *Ahimsa*, he is guilty of the sin of violence as Earth, Water etc. and moving lives like small insects are killed in such action. Benevolent deeds involving injury to living beings even when directed to benefit a completely non-violent person are sinful. A true votary of complete *Ahimsa* will never make himself a party to these sinful acts by enjoying or making use of the things prepared

for them. When acts of benevolence involving injury to small beings are sinful, the protection of a *Sadhu* by killing the enemy or the cruel animal cannot but be the same. A *Sadhu* cannot eulogise any of the above acts. If he does so he falls from his vow of complete *Ahimsa*.

If may be argued that the small insects and animals are beings of a lower plane. Causing injury to them may be sinful but the merit accruing out of protection offered to human beings especially to a pious saint is greater and outweighs the sin incurred. So ultimately the act of protection is virtuous inspite of the little *Himsa* involved in the same.

Jainism regards all beings as possessed of the same conscious soul. There is no difference between the soul of one-organned and the five-organned rational beings. So killing of the one for the sake of the other cannot be called meritorious in any sense. A human being assuming superiority puts greater value to his own comforts but this is only selfishness of the person enjoying the privileged position. According to *Jainism* no act can be meritorious if it involves *Himsa*. An act cannot be both sinful and meritorious at the same time. As milk cannot come out by churning the water similarly no merit can accrue out of a violent act however insignificant it may be in a layman's eyes. The principle of *Anekantbad* or many foldness of views or angles has no application whatsoever in these cases. A seed cannot bear two kinds of fruits, similarly an act while being sinful cannot be meritorious at the same time.

Saint Bhicaji has at one place very wittingly remarked : Suppose = *Brahmin* has a small handkerchief

Some body comes and snatches it from him and puts it in the pocket of a rich Bridegroom going to his father-in-law's house. What will you think of the act? Will not the person doing so be called a plunderer? Similarly a person who kills beings for the comforts of a human being or a piously saint is murderer if he does injury to the lives of even small beings. Thus it is clear that killing does not find favour with *Jainism* even in circumstances where the protected person is completely non violent and is a pious saint and great benefactor of mankind.

(4) Now we come to the fourth case where the protected and the protector are on the same plane not as complete *Ahimsals* as in the first case but as being partial *Ahimsals* or no *Ahimsals* at all.

According to *Jainism* a person who does not renounce *Himsa* at all is called *Asanyami* or completely unrestrained and one who renounces *Himsa* to some extent is called *Sanyamasanyami* or partially restrained. The worldly activities of an unrestrained or partially restrained person are all sinful and violent as they are directed towards material achievements and not towards spiritual advancement. Whoever protects a violent person supports his violent existence and is sinful. *Jainism* says "Don't live unrestrained life. Neither have love for the unrestrained life of others. If anything is to be loved it is religion and the renouncing of sinful activities."

Jainism regards non-violence as the eternal law and even in cases where both the protected and protector are *Ahimsals* the same law is allowed to prevail.

It says 'Death is an eternal law It is a stern reality which is sure to be fulfilled some day or other There is nothing therefore to be worried at the approach of death which must come sooner or later whether one wishes it or not It may come as a natural event in due course or as a catastrophe suddenly It makes no difference how it comes Then why should it be feared and not faced calmly There is nothing to shudder at the approach of a certain fact One should not get angry or annoyed at the sight of barbarities and murder and indulge one self in the very act which is revolting to one's own sentiment when committed by others

It may be asked a house holder has parents, children, wife attendants and other male and female members How should he behave when assaulted as in Norkhali and Bihar

Such calamities themselves prove the futility of violent methods Protection by violence is out of question when attacked by an overwhelming number If anything can offer protection in such acute circumstances, it is *Ahimsa* alone Virtue of non-violence should be demonstrated by utter calmness and complete fearlessness Moral influence should be thrown If that proves futile death should be met with calmness as a matter of course Prayer for self purification should be resorted to No attachment for the body should be maintained Hatred malice or violence has been declared sinful even in these circumstances There should be no panic no betrayal of each other but pious and ennobling religious songs should be sung to keep the moral strength high This is the true religion which should guide the relations even between persons who are not devoted to non-violence in full or even partially if they find

themselves morally so weak as not to be able to desist from violent retaliation, it is their choice. But it is no act of *Ahimsa* or an act ennobling the soul and causing merit. There are thousands of acts which worldly people do reciprocally and for mutual advantage but all such acts cannot be labelled as religious. There are thousands of acts which may be thought necessary to be done for co operative life and protection of common interest but their sanction should not be sought in religion. A man builds a palatial house at the cost of innumerable small lives, will it be called an act of religion simply because it adds to his comfort and the comfort of the members of his family? As there is no religion in erecting a building yet it is erected with a feeling of personal comfort, similiary acts of communal and national growth and worldly prosperity may be undertaken from a sense of reciprocal feeling of belonging to the same stock, nation or community. It is not necessary that they should have their inspiration in religion. *Jainism* does not support acts of *Himsa* whatever may be the aim for which they are undertaken.

Ahimsa and outward influence

There is a Butcher who is taking goats for slaughter. A rich person offers money and releases the goats. Sympathy here does not coincide with apathy to anybody. Is not this act of protection meritorious?

According to *Jainism* there are five cardinal sins (1) to kill beings, (2) to tell lies, (3) to steal others property, (4) to indulge in sexual intercourse, and (5) to keep and enjoy wealth and earthly possessions. *Jainism* says that to

commit any of the sins in any of the ways to protect others is sinful and no sort of merit accrues. To make the truth of this general principle self evident we shall give here some illustrations.

A thief runs away with stolen properties. The owner follows him and tries to trace him out. While in this pursuit he meets two persons who know the whereabouts of the thief. On the owner's asking the whereabouts of the thief, one of the person keeps silent but the other gives him a wrong direction. The owner goes astray and misses the thief and consequently his valuables. It is apparent that the first person does not incur any sin as he refrains from falsehood or harmful truth but what about the second person who gives the wrong information and misguides the owner. Is this act of his meritorious?

A severe famine breaks out. Poor people are seen dying out of hunger. A band of philanthropic persons plunder the granaries of a well to do person and feed the poor. Is this act religious on the part of the plunderers?

A couple is passing through a desert. A lustful person attacks the husband and tries to kill him. The lady requests the assailant to desist from murder and just to save her husband voluntarily offers her body to that person. Is this act meritorious?

If the answer is in the negative, Jainism asks how can the act of saving the goats by offering wealth be meritorious? A votary of complete *Ahimsa* is also a complete renouncer of wealth. Possession of any kind is incompatible with the vow of *Ahimsa*. Whoever gives wealth to others

commits the sin of *Parigraha* as he helps other in enjoying the same. By giving money to a butcher the rich man enables him to purchase a greater number of goats and to make a good turnover rapidly. This intensifies the act of slaughter. In no circumstances it puts a stop to its recurrence in future. This is supporting *Himsa* indirectly. How can an act which multiplies the commission of *Himsa* be called meritorious? To offer *Parigraha* is as sinful as the commission of the other sins and a person should not try to save others by commission of sins himself. According to Jainism sins follow the doer and no one is exonerable from the fruits thereof. A poppy seed cannot be expected to bring forth a mango tree. Similarly sinful acts cannot be expected to yield virtuous results even if they result in the protection of certain beings.

It is no religion to save lives by the use of threat, force, allurements of wealth or any other sinful influence or methods. This is simply causing the degradation of one's own soul for the supposed good of others.

Ahimsa , a virtue of the heart

Ahimsa is a religion of the heart and it cannot be forced upon anybody. To try to compel or oblige others to be non-violent is itself violence and a votary of *Ahimsa* cannot take recourse to the same. *Ahimsa* is a creed. It requires inner recognition and purity of feelings. No one can be *Ahimsak* without inner appreciation and deep faith in the virtue of non-violence. Saint *Bhikari* has rightly remarked 'There are seven great addictions according to Jainism viz (1) Gambling, (2) Meat eating, (3) Drinking

liquors, (4) Visiting houses of ill-fame, (5) Hunting, (6) Stealing and (7) Adultery. Any person who desists forcibly anybody even from these great vices is a sinner according to Jainism. To force anything upon a person against his will is violence pure and simple. One who obstructs the sense pleasures of addicted persons, or curbs their desire against their will, acquires the *karmas* infatuating the soul. A person can be made virtuous only by the change of heart and moral influence. No one can be forced to be good. Non violence of the heart is the essential foundation of a noble life. Non violence of the body is of no avail if the heart goes on killing and there is no mind and will to be non-violent. Non violence of the person in fetters is the non violence of the unwilling and the forced and is not at all purifying.

There was a butcher named *Kalsaukarika* in the times of *Lord Mahavira*. He used to slaughter one hundred goats every day. He was so cruel as nobody could induce him to stop slaughter even for a day. One day Emperor *Srenika* went to pay his obeisance to *Lord Mahavira*. A leper also went to pay homage to the *Lord*. After paying his respects the leper said that it is better for *Srenika* to live long. When asked about the inner significance of this utterance of the leper, *Lord Mahavira* explained to *Srenika* that after his death he was to go to hell. So it is better that he should live long as he was in a happy state in his present life. Having heard this about his future life *Srenika* became quite sad and began to ask the *Lord* if there was any way out from the foretold future life. *Lord Mahavira* said that it was possible only if *Kalsaukarika* stopped slaughter for a day. *Srenika* was quite glad to hear this as he thought it very easy. He ordered to call the butcher and asked him

to desist from slaughter for a day. The butcher was not willing and did not consent. *Srenika* got angry and ordered to bind him hand and feet and put him in a well.

After the day was over *Srenika* went over to *Lord Mahavira* again and told him that butcher did not kill any goat that day and that he was lucky enough to avert his fate. *Lord Mahavira* said 'you are doomed for hell. It is true that the butcher had no goats to kill but what of that? He took filth off his body, converted the same into 100 goats by the help of water and killed them one by one with his finger. Though his hand and feet were not free yet his mind was virulently active and killed goats in unagination. The butcher did not desist but he was forced to desist from physical violence.' The story amply illustrates that there is no abstinence without consent or consciousness. Abstinence is what is of one's own choice and free-will. It cannot be imposed.

Why is Ahimsa a Virtue ?

Ahimsa is a virtuous attitude of mind. *Lord Mahavira* has said "As water passes away from a high level so the sins of one who is placed on the terrace of non violence goes of the soul." Killing of others is the greatest sin and non violence the supreme virtue. *Lord Mahavira* has placed *Ahimsa* as the first among the virtues to be cultivated for the purification of soul. He has called it the ennobling self restraint.

तत्त्वमिदं पदमिदं महावीरेण देसितम्

अहिंसा निजणा दिद्धा सत्यं भूयस्तु सयमा ।

According to *Him* it is a firm island in a surging ocean and the only resort in the frowning sea. He has called *Ahimsa* as the highest knowledge of the seers—the quintessence of their wisdom. *Himsa* is the root of all vices. It is hostility and lack of goodwill against the living creatures. It is ill treatment of the worst form. It is a cause of great fear and breeding ground for enmity. *Ahimsa* is, therefore, a virtue in itself and its value is self determined. It is a guarantee of good behaviour from one's own self and being the highest self culture is most ennobling. It is why Lord Mahavira has said 'Be non violent for thy own sake. The good of your own soul requires you to be non violent. It is no obligation or charity towards any body.'

People say *Ahimsa* is a great virtue as it offers protection to other beings. *Ahimsa* is meritorious on account of its protective value. It is meant for protecting others. Lord Mahavira has on the other hand said that *Ahimsa* is a great virtue as it is abstinence from the sin of *Himsa* or hurting others. It is an antidote to self pollution and an abandonment of evil tendencies. One who takes the vow to abstain himself from violence and does all in his power to stick to it, is non violent even though lives are killed. On the otherhand a person who is negligent in observing his vow, strictly or does not take the vow to abstain from any injury or for whom non injury is only a matter of chance and not of intentional volition is sinful even if no lives are killed. There is no relation as that of cause and effect between *Ahimsa* and saving of lives. Whether lives are killed or not killed a person who does not consciously and carefully observe his vow is guilty of the

offence of *Himsa*. Similarly a person who consciously observes his vow is not bound by any karmas even though lives are killed. It has been nicely said —

मरुदुष जियदुजीघो, अयदाचारस्सणिच्छिदा हिंसा ।

पयदस्सणत्थि यधो, हिंसामित्तेण समिदस्स ॥

Again it has been said —

"A careless soul under the influence of passions, first injures the self, through the self, whether there is subsequently an injury caused to another being or not is immaterial."

यस्मात्सकपाय सन् हत्यात्मा प्रथममात्मनाऽऽत्मानम्,

पश्चाज्जायेत न या हिंसा प्राण्यन्तराणां तु ।

जीव बहो अप्पबहो जीवदया अप्पणो दया होइ

तासव्व जीव हिंसा / परिचत्ता अत्तकामेहि ।

From what has been said above it is quite clear that *Jain Ahimsa* lays emphasis on purification of the soul by abstinence from *Himsa* and is not concerned whether lives are saved or not. It preaches virtue for virtue's sake. It preaches *Ahimsa* for the sake of saving the soul from the sin of *Himsa* and not for protecting other beings who may or may not be protected. *Lord Mahavira* has said that a person who steadily evolves the virtue of *Ahimsa* attains completeness day by day like the waning bright moon on the full moon day and a person who develops violence gradually wanes and vanishes in darkness like the waning moon on the dark moon day. *Ahimsa* wipes off the sins and purifies the soul. *Himsa* taints it with vice and darkens it. *Ahimsa* is an essential virtue for the upliftment of the soul. *Himsa* pulls it down and soils it.

Purification of soul is the highest aim and *Ahimsa* is an infallible means to this end. It is, therefore, for the ennobling of the soul that the culture of *Ahimsa* is essential. *Saint Bhicaji* has very nicely dealt on the subject as follows:

"People say 'saving of life is the cause and removing of sins is the effect. There can be no effect without cause. How can there be merits in *Ahimsa* without the cause—the consequential saving of beings?' Those who argue thus are wrong. No doubt removing of sin is the effect but is it the effect of saving lives? Is it a certainty that no lives will be killed after a person becomes completely non violent? Can it be said that no lives are killed by a completely non violent *Sadhu* while walking, standing or doing such other acts? *Jivas* always die of their own Karmas and a person who is non violent in all its mode is not responsible for their death even though caused through the instrumentality of his body. Due to full self restraint and purity of heart the elements of *Himsa* are absent. Life long fast has been prescribed as a religious act by *Lord Mahavira* and death is a sure outcome of this life long fast but can the act be called violent for this reason? A wicked person lives on his wickedness and tries to save himself day and night. Is it *Ahimsa* simply because life is saved? *Ahimsa* generates the feeling of equanimity or of looking all beings as one's own soul. It is a restraint upon anger, pride, deceit and greed. It is a shut door against sins. It destroys the old sins. It is on account of this purifying influence that *Ahimsa* has been regarded as a great virtue. The removing of sins is due to this purification of heart and is not due to the protection, if any, indirectly extended to other beings. Protection to beings may be one of the resultants but

it is not with this view that the vow of *Ahimsa* is undertaken. It is wrong to suggest that the merit of *Ahimsa* rests on the protection it offers to other beings. *Ahimsa* is a virtue on account of its intrinsic quality and purifying character. Suppose a person takes a vow not to cut any tree. The tree is saved. Another takes vow not to steal. Others' property is saved. Religion does not consist in the saving of the tree or the protection afforded to the wealth of others. The religion is somewhere beyond—it is in the self-restraint imposed on one's inclination to be cruel to trees or to rob others of their wealth. As evil propensities are restricted and as attachment is removed the soul purifies itself and the religion lies in this self-purification. To make the matter more clear another example may be given. Suppose there is a pros. The Lover of the pros takes upon himself the vow of not visiting houses of ill fame. Pros hears of this, tries to persuade her lover to give up the vow but he sticks to the same in spite of all temptations. The pros becomes disappointed and commits suicide by throwing herself in a well. Will the lover be responsible for this suicide of the pros? How can a person who has taken the Vow of *Brahmacharyya* for betterment of his soul be held responsible for death? If he is not sinful, how is a person virtuous because of the saving of the tree or the wealth of somebody? To abstain from sin is in itself virtuous. Religion does not depend on what happens to other beings—whether others are benefitted or harmed. It depends on how far a person is harmless in his own conduct and behaviour. There are many violent acts where there is no death involved. But a votary of *Ahimsa* has to give up all such acts even though apparently no death occurs e.g. acts of mental violence."

How far an Ahimsak is benefactor

I have already said at one place that a violent person injures himself through self. It has been said in Jain Scriptures that even a cut-throat enemy does not do that harm which a wicked person does to himself by his wickedness. As *Himsa* is harmful in itself so *Ahimsa* is a virtue in itself. It is self benevolence. A person who becomes a votary of *Ahimsa* benefits himself most. It is a mere vanity on the part of a votary of *Ahimsa* to claim that he is a protector or benefactor of others. It is not in his power to benefit or protect others. If he is instrumental in such acts it is by the dictates of the fate of others and an *Ahimsak* cannot take pride in the same. He cannot claim any credit for it. As *Jivas* die of their own *Karmas* so also they live or are protected by their own. A third person cannot do or undo their fate. One can simply refrain himself from vicious acts and whosoever does so saves his soul from being vitiated and is no more responsible for deaths occurring all round him.

According to Jainism only that person is benefactor who saves his soul or the soul of others from sins. To save one's soul from sins is self benevolence and to save others from sins is philanthropy. A person who effects change in the heart of others by noble preachings and converts them to the cause of *Ahimsa* is certainly a great benefactor as he saves or rescues a habitual sinner. He is the true saviour. It has been very appropriately said —

सयन्मि वि जियणेण, तेण इहं धोमिओ जमाप्ताओ
इवपि ओ दुहत्त, सत्तं बोहर जिणवयणे

"A person who converts a single unhappy person to the preachings of *Lord Jina*, causes a proclamation of non-injury to be announced throughout the three worlds"

Saint Bhicany has rightly said "There had been infinite Arihants in times past who practised and preached the law of *Ahimsa*. They could benefit only those who heard and embraced the idea of *Ahimsa* at their feet. They could not do any benefit to other creatures of all the six kinds who may be said to have been survived only to reap the fruits of their own actions. *Jivas* live infinitely. Death is only a change of form. *Jivas* pass through transmigrations and reap the fruits of their own actions. Life is not at all valuable if it is not for the observance of religion. Protection is of no value if it means only continuance of a sinful life. *Saints* and *seers* never try to protect or help the protection of sinful lives.

Jainism says that right knowledge, right faith, right conduct and right austerities—these four form the path of Liberation. Whoever preaches the noble four-fold path is a true benefactor. A person who is taught these paths is also benefited as his soul is ennobled. There is no other person or being who may be said to be protected. *Lord Nem Nath* gave up the idea of marriage with *Rajmati*. The animals brought for marriage feast were saved. *Lord Nem Nath* saved himself from the sin to which he would have been a party had he consented to marriage but what good may he said to have done towards the goats that were saved? They remained to be killed by somebody else. He thought of his self and self alone when he uttered "the killing of these screaming beings for marriage feast will not be for the benefit of my soul."

जइ मभ कारणं नप हम्मति सुयजिया ।
न म गय ॥ तिससं पग्लोमो मविस्मइ ॥

War and Ahimsa

War and *Ahimsa* are conflicting things. Where there is war there is no *Ahimsa* and where there is *Ahimsa* there can be no war. As war is an annihilation or negation of *Ahimsa* it is never blissful or meritorious much less commendable. Jainism has always and as a matter of principle abhorred war. There may have been a great number of instances where Jain laymen took part in wars or were themselves the sponsors thereof but they never treated wars as religious but tooled their act as ultimately harmful to the cause of the Soul. To take part in war has been for them a matter of deep atonement.

Lord Rishava, was the first religious preacher or *Tirthankara* of the Jains. He had one hundred sons. The eldest was *Bharat*. *Lord Rishava* before he initiated himself into the holy order of ascetics distributed his kingdom amongst his 100 sons. Afterwards *Bharat* aspired to conquer all the six parts of the world and asked his brothers to obey his sway and to hand over to him their part of the kingdom. *Bahubali* refused to do so and so also the remaining 98 brothers. However the 98 brothers went to pay homage to *Lord Rishava* and by the by talked to him about the great injustice that *Bharat* was going to perpetrate against them all. *Lord Rishava* said 'This wealth and kingdom is transient. The entire earth with all its wealth is not sufficient to quench the thirst of greed. Attachment is also as great a sin as greed. Do not bear any attachment to your

wealth and kingdom Give up them all voluntarily and surrender your souls to yourselves Do not allow yourselves to be conquered by others, for the sake of wealth and property The ninety-eight sons of *Rishava* were convinced of the truth and become initiated into the holy order leaving all their wealth and property behind A great war was averted by the non-violent preachings of *Lord Rishava* Attachment and hatred are the two great causes of war To be patriotic to one's own nation or country to the extent of exclusion of all considerations for other nations or countries is attachment and to be indifferent to the rights or welfare of other nations or countries is aversion or hatred To think always of self aggrandisement at the cost of others or to exploit others for the sake of one's upliftment is the root cause of all wars *Tirthankars* have always preached for the eradication of these two great evils They have always preached "keep aloof from attachment and hatred"

Nemi was a Kshatriya Prince of *Mithila* He renounced his kingdom and wanted to take to holy order At that time a Brahmin approached him and said "Oh King ! You are a Kshatriya Prince Show your mettle first You should first conquer the kings—who are still unsubjugated and then only should you think of initiation" *Nemi* replied

जो सहस्र सहस्राण सगामे दुज्जण जिणे
एग जिणेज्ज अप्पाण एस से परमो जजो

"Greater is the victory of him, who conquers his only Soul than of him who conquers thousands of valient foes in a fierce battle"

अप्याणमेव जुज्झाहि किं ते जुज्जेण यज्जमा
अप्याणमेव अप्याण जइत्ता सुह मेहण

Fight with thy own self What is the use of fighting with external foes ? Be happy by conquering thy soul thyself "

Now what has been said above, it is apparent that Jainism has regarded the conquering of passions as one of the most fierce battle and the success in such battle as the supreme victory It has always denounced external war किं ते जुज्जेण यज्जमा — 'Of what avail is to fight externally'—has been repeated so many times in *Jain Scriptures*

Lord Mahavira was the 24th *Thirthankara* or the last religious preacher possessing the supreme knowledge and flourished about three thousand years back He was the greatest votary of *Ahimsa* of his time and is still unsurpassed as an uncompromising champion of *Ahimsa* He has said in one of his discourses

कोहो पीइ पणासेइ माणो विणय नासजा
माया मित्तानि नासेइ होमा सत्य विणासणो

"Anger destroys the cordial relations pride destroys humility, deceit destroys friendship and greed destroys everything "

No one can doubt that anger or feelings of wrath and condemnation, pride or false sense of prestige, deceit or mutual betrayal of trust, and greed or insatiable desire for self-aggrandisement have brought about the colossal destruction under which the present world is so helplessly groaning

Lord Mahavira has further said

उग्रमेण हणे कोह, माण मद्वया जिणे
मायमज्जयमावेण लोभ सतोसओ जिणे

"Conquer anger by quietness pride by humility, deceit by simplicity and greed by contentment"

Calmness, contentment, humility and simplicity are the four great virtues and there is no doubt that a nation wide culture of the same would lead to universal brotherhood and permanent peace of the world

Jainism has always said that war cannot lead to peace. It can only lead to war. Enmity can not be calmed down by enmity in return. Fire cannot extinguish fire. Enmity can only be pacified by virtue of *Ahimsa*.

In *Gita*, *Lord Krishna* said to *Arjuna* "in case you will fall in battle field you would attain heaven." Thus *Arjuna* *Krishna* exhorted *Arjuna* to fight

हतो वा प्रापस्यमि म्वर्गं जित्वा वा भोक्ष्यसे महीम्
तस्मादुत्तिष्ठ कौन्तेय युद्धाय कृतनिश्चय

A contrast to the above suggestion of *Lord Krishna* is found in *Bhagvati Sutra* of the Jains. Once *Gotama*, the foremost desciple of *Lord Mahavira* asked him—"Many people say that those who are killed in battle field attain heaven—how far is this true?" *Lord Mahavira* replied that, it was not true and then explained how people came to utter this. He said "In *Vaisali* there was a person named *Paruna* who was the grandson of *Nag*. He was a layman devotee of great affluence and used to fast every third day

When the *Rattamishai* war broke out he was forced to join the battle under the order of the king and his cabinet. He prolonged his fasting period before joining the battle in obedience of the *Astrosaid* order. When he sat in his chariot, he took the following vow: "I will strike only the person who strikes me first. I will not strike or kill others." After going to the battle field he was confronted with a strong warrior but he remained firm and did not kill him so long as he was not attacked first. In this way *Paruna* was severely wounded and at last when death seemed to draw near he retired to loneliness, took his seat in a solitary bed of dried *kusha* grass and facing himself towards the east uttered the following salutation:

"Obeisance to the *Arihantas*, obeisance to the Liberated ones, obeisance to religious preceptors, obeisance to the religious heads and obeisance to all the *Sadhus*. I offer my humble respect from this place to the Lord. May he accept my humble respect from this place. Since long I was placed only in five gross vows. Now I take to life-long great vows." Having said this he put off his armour, quilt and arrows and died peacefully after atoning for his sins.

A friend of *Paruna* was also with him in the battle field. When he saw the wounded *Paruna* retiring from the battle field he also followed suit and said—"whatever vows my friend *Paruna* has embraced the same are also to me." In this way both the friends counted the death very calmly.

When gods saw that *Paruna* and his friend were dead they sprinkled scented water over their dead bodies and also showered flowers of five colours. The gods celebrated

unpractical precept. People have become akin and addicted to life of violence to such an extent that they think it impossible to convert themselves to the concept of *Ahimsa*. Dr. Katzu has rightly remarked: "Violence has stolen a long march during thousand of years. There are so many misconceptions to be removed. Non-Violence is unintelligible to so many. To some it is a counsel of perfection, fit for *rishis* only. To others it is stupid, there is seemingly such a child like faith in violence."

People have become totally blind to stern realities of life and its value. They have forgotten to contemplate on the real welfare of the soul and are thus deprived of the great inspiration to noble life which such contemplation offers. It has been truly said: "It is necessary to revise some of our prevailing notions about civilisation and happiness. There is a direct relation between an ease-loving life and violence. Deeds of colossal magnitude and pomp, and a life of dazzling prosperity and luxury cannot be raised and maintained without violence. It is a mistake to regard these as marks of civilisation."

The present structure of society puts a definite premium on violence, in the circumstances, how can *Ahimsa* be made a religion of the masses? The solution is simple but strenuous. It depends on right kind of training and discipline and our real to put forth incessant endeavours to educate the masses on proper lines. Our ways of life have got to be remodelled the outlook of life has got to be radically changed. The present theory of relative value which assigns to materialism a higher place than spiritualism has got to be recast. Religion and morality are to be assigned their right place in the hearts of humanity. This

is possible only by completely overhauling the present system of education, nay by replacing the same by a system which would create pious hearts not intelligent minds only, which would teach men nobler qualities of heart and purify their inner feelings and not only sharpen the intellect, which may not produce good engineers, doctors, aviators or barristers, etc., but which would produce men of pure character and pious hearts. Once this is done, *Ahimsa* will have its right place in the hearts of men. It will begin to appear them to be the only natural course of life. Dr. Kitzu has rightly remarked

"I personally think that the ideal of non violence is not unrealizable. On the contrary, I think that it can be reached, and that humanity, after the experience of the horrors of two world wars in the course of a quarter of a century, will willingly strive after it. But to attain that goal we shall have to educate public opinion in its favour, more particularly by radically planning the whole field of education on the basis of non violence. We must begin with the child and mould the mind of the coming generation accordingly."

To make *Ahimsa* a religion of the masses, strenuous efforts should be made to remove the misconceptions about it. Right visions are to be implanted in very heart by right kind of education. Young minds must be trained up on the ideology of *Ahimsa*. Jainism prescribes many important rules of discipline and mental training for a person who aspires to be non-violent. A universal adoption of these basic precepts will go a long way in creating mental atmosphere for the growth of a non violent life. We summarize these teachings in-brief here

(1) All lives are as sacred as the human life Killing of other lives is as sinful as the killing of the human life

(2) All souls are in essence the same The distinction of body, sense organs, knowledge, race, colour, country, etc., is superficial and has no justification for partial treatment

(3) Attachment is as bad as hatred and contempt Impartiality is the real virtue

(4) Death is no calamity but a natural event It is not extinction but rebirth according to one's own action It is not a termination but a fresh lease of life

(5) There is no external enemy The soul is its own friend or enemy By its good actions, it is its friend By its bad actions, it is its enemy

(6) Death is the dictate of one's own fate and not the deed of others

(7) Religion is the highest bliss It consists in *Ahimsa*, self restraint and penance

(8) Religion is precious than life itself A life which is sacrificed at the altar of religion is always purified and ennobled

(9) Material prosperity is no prosperity Wealth, power and all kinds of material possessions are detrimental to the real happiness of the soul

(10) Sense-pleasures are painful in the long run like the *Kimpak* fruit which is sweet in taste only but poisonous in effect

(11) As you sow so you reap Sin always follows the sinner. It never looks to the motive of the person but to his actions. Whatever may be the purpose and whoever the person for whom a sin is committed the doer alone is responsible. Bad actions have always bad fruits and good actions always good.

(12) Human life is the most precious of all lives and most difficult to obtain. The summum bonum of human life is the culture of religion. This should not be trifled away.

The above ideology is essential for the growth of a right frame of mind. As a seed cannot bear fruit in barren land so also the principle of *Ahimsa* cannot grow and flourish on a rock bed of outlook based on violence.

Besides training the young generation on the ideology of non-violence, a living faith in the ideal of *Ahimsa* should be created by other means as well. Lord Mahavira wanted to spread the ideal of *Ahimsa*. He had to devote his entire life for its sake. All his sermons are full of great devotion towards the cause of *Ahimsa*. And he gave not only valuable ethical sermons for mental discipline but gave charming stories and fascinating fictions to educate the people in the ways of this virtue. He lived to instil and inspire a feeling of deep rooted respect for non-violence and non-violent life and aroused a feeling of deep indignation towards violence of all sorts. It was by this steady and all round process of working within and bringing about the mental change that he could achieve wonderful success in his mission. Not only the ordinary folk but warriors of great fame and kings and

emperors of great prowess fell on his feet and became devotees to the cause of *Ahimsa*. Great dacoits, murderers and blood-hungry warriors were converted into staunch advocates of *Ahimsa* and their execution for their past cruelties were exemplary.

It was the firm faith and deep conviction of *Lord Mahavira* which wrought such miracles. The miracle of making *Ahimsa* a mass religion is capable of being achieved even to day provided those who have faith in it, endeavour unceasingly to infuse the same in others. People are living in an age of great scientific upheaval, which has made them all the more sceptical. Superstitions born of growing materialism are looming large in the mental horizon. In the circumstances those who profess *Ahimsa* as religion have to bear the torch in the midst of heavy storms. They must perform their task with Herculean strength. They must unceasingly endeavour by precept and example to create a living faith in *Ahimsa*.

A brief sketch of the means to be harnessed for the propagation of the ideal of *Ahimsa* to make it a mass religion would be as follows —

1. A sense of highest chivalry and pride in deeds of *Ahimsa* should be inculcated. This can be awakened and developed through devotional literature on *Ahimsa*. The educationists, the authors, philosophers, poets and historians all should be encouraged to bring forth inspiring literature on the subject. The screen, the platform, the schools and the colleges—all must be directed by a common policy of educating the people on the lines of non violence.

2 To remodel the social festivals, customs, etiquettes and manners so as to base the same on the principle of *Ahimsa*

3 To bring into light the lives and achievements of all great saints and apostles of *Ahimsa* and to start research work on their achievements

4 To set apart a particular day in a year as a day of complete cessation from all worldly activities and observance of complete fasting, prayer, meditation and expiation of sins. Jains observe such a day on *Bhadra Sudi* 4th or 5th as the case may be. It is called *Samvatsara* or the best day of the year. All have to observe fast and devote themselves to prayer with observance of celibacy. All have to recapitulate the sins committed during the year and beseech for forgiveness with all humbleness and purity of heart. The spirit of the observance of this day will be best understood by reading the following couplets

मयस्स जीवसिस्स भावओ धम्मनिहिअनिअचित्ते ।
 सरे खमाणत्ता समामि मयस्स अहय पि ॥
 खामेमि सव्वे जीवे मरे जीवा समतु मे ।
 मित्ती मे सव्वमूएसु वेर मज्झ न वेणइ ॥
 ज ज मणेण वद्ध ज ज घायाए भासिज पाय ।
 ज ज काएण म्हा मिच्छा मि दुक्कड तस्स ॥

“With feelings of devotion towards religion and with all internal piety, I beseech forgiveness of all living beings for the sins I have committed towards them. I on my turn also forgive them.”

'I beseech forgiveness of all Let all beings forgive me I have amity towards all and enmity towards no one'

"Whatever sins I may have indulged in mentally whatever misdeeds I may have done by words of mouth whatever sins I may have bodily committed—let all my sins prove futile—I repent and atone for all"

5 State policy must be directed on principles of *Ahimsa* Dr Katsu suggests —

'The conclusion, in my view, is that in our present environment non violence can only succeed as a creed and nothing else Just as Soviet Russia made deliberate attempt to alter the whole structure of society and modify all the current and accepted notions of human nature by conscious state effort, similarly those who believe in non violence and non-cooperation as the future hope of humanity must acquire power in body politic in non violent ways, and then endeavour to make non violence the only essential instrument of our national policy'

100

101

102

